Vol. X, No. 45 HUMAN EVENTS November 11, 1953

# FIND THE FREE WORLD

*By* GARET GARRETT

WHAT DOES ANYBODY mean — the free world? A world so divided that the lovely banners of freedom are all on one side and the hateful Red banners on the other?

That question first came up on May 27, 1941, when our President said: "Today the whole world is divided between slavery and human freedom — between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal."

At that moment Russia was on the side of the pagans, trampling down freedom in partnership with Hitler. Less than one month later the President of the United States embraced Russia as a member of the free world, dedicated to the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter, and began to pour Lend-Lease aid into her ports. It was the same Russia still, only that Hitler had turned on her and to save herself she had to intone the slogans of the free world and make the sign of the cross.

Ten years later Senator Taft's questions were answered. He was against Lend-Lease aid to Russia, and asked: "Will that part of the world which Stalin conquers with our war planes and our tanks be consecrated to freedom? Or, after a Russian victory with our aid, must we step in with our armies to impose the four freedoms on millions of people 10,000 miles away who have never known either freedom from want or freedom from terrorism?"

So there is one thing you may know for sure about the free world; namely, that its face is subject to sudden change.

But what else do you know about it? What is it? Where are its boundaries? Who are its people?

Try Rand McNally. Search the twenty maps of Europe and West Asia, the nine of Eurasia, the seven of South America; then the maps of Africa, Australia and Oceania and those of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and find the countries to which American dollars at the rate of 5 to 7 billion a year have been going as economic and military aid in defense of the free world. Then turn to a scenario map of the world as a whole and try to make a continuous line that will connect them. If you could do that you might have the boundaries of the free world. But you cannot do it.

Well, perhaps in this age of intercontinental aviation at supersonic speed the parts of the free world do not have to be contiguous in a physical sense — only in a political sense. So try it another way. Just set down the names of the countries that have been receiving

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic and military aid from the United States, either in alphabetical order or by continents and regions. Then what do you get? Certainly nothing you can imagine to be a table of essential political ingredients for a free world. It looks more like a queue, with at least one thing in common, namely, an appetite for American dollars. What is the bond of ideas between Burma or Siam on one side of the world and Belgium or Scandinavia on the other side? It is not even anti-Communist. A great deal of it is neutral, like India, and some of it teeters on the fence, saying, "Dollars, dollars, lest we fall into the hands of the Communists."

SINCE IT IS CURIOUSLY true that while all of our foreign allies receive dollars, all the countries that receive dollars are not allies, we should perhaps limn the features of the free world by first setting down the allies. Who are they?

The idea of a free world, in defense of which the United States has assumed unlimited military liabilities, rests entirely upon the doctrine of Collective Security; and the heart of the Collective Security System is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The twelve original members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were: the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway and Portugal. To these have been added Turkey and Greece, making fourteen. The meaning of the Treaty, in the words of the Secretary of State, is that "an attack on any one of us means an attack upon all of us". Thus, literally, if Yugoslavia should attack Italy in a quarrel over Trieste, that would be the same as if she attacked the United States and we should be obliged to behave accordingly. The ironic fact there is that in defense of the free world American aid has been going also to Yugoslavia, which is a Communist state under the dictatorship of Tito, so that if Italy and Yugoslavia should fight they would be turning American weapons on each other.

Does Yugoslavia belong to the free world?

Does Spain, who has been receiving American aid in exchange for air bases?

A year ago, the answer in both cases was no. Now the answer must be that it is as if they belonged. Or is it?

The European members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization harmonize but one tune — "Dollars, sweet dollars". Unlike the felicitous Burmese who say, "Either dollars without strings, please, or no dollars at all", the Europeans take the position that since the Americans, by their own theme, must have allies in the Old World, and since, by that same theme, defense of Western Europe is vital to the security of the United States, it behooves the Americans to provide dollars for both armaments and welfare. Therefore they (Americans) are arrogant and unreasonable to think they can tie strings to their dollars or that their dollars entitle them to meddle in anybody's foreign policy or lay down the law of the free world.

Indeed, the ideas of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on what is good for the free world are so conflicting — as when Great Britain says China ought to be admitted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the United Nations and the United States says no, or when the United States wants to rearm Germany and France says no — that every little while the British and French Foreign Ministers and the American Secretary of State have to hold reconciliatory conferences, at which nothing is ever quite reconciled.

There is then a Collective Security System on the other side of the world. The United States has signed Mutual Defense Pacts with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and Japan. Three of these are natural allies. American power saved them from Japanese conquest, and now it is not gratitude but self-interest that holds them in the American orbit. However, the idea of mutual defense is somewhat eyebright. The United States is obliged to go to their defense, but how could they come to the defense of the United States?

As to the fourth, which is Japan, there is some ambiguity. Under American tutelage during the occupation, Japan adopted a constitution in which she renounced forever the right to wage war; and now she seems reluctant, even with American assistance, to rearm herself to fight for the free world, if it should come to that; on the other hand, the United States is obliged by treaty to protect her from aggression. If you say Japan belongs to the free world you are involved in this bewilderment of fact — that whereas less than ten years ago she was its terrible enemy, now she is in a position to enjoy its blessings and to claim its protection and at the same time under no obligation to fight for it.

Outside of the Pacific Pact the United States has assumed obligations toward other Asiatic countries — toward South Korea and toward Formosa. If you think South Korea and Formosa ought to belong to the free world, what will you say about Indo-China? There the United States is bearing two-thirds of the cost of the war France continues to wage against not only Communism but against nationalism as well — a spectacle that makes it plausible for Asians to say that the Americans, talking of a free world, are nevertheless upholding European imperialism in the East.

Lastly, there is a hemispheric system of collective security, called the Rio Pact. It is open to all the countries of Central and South America, whatever they call themselves. Generally, they call themselves republics. Argentina was asked to sign and refused; if she had signed she would now belong to the free world, notwithstanding the fact that what freedom survives there exists by whim of a dictator. Cuba signed; and Cuba is ruled by a dictator. The other countries that have signed the Rio Pact are Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Ecuador. In view of the fact that for more than 100 years the United States has been bound by its own Monroe Doctrine to resist any aggression by a non-American power against any country on the South American Continent, this Rio Pact must be regarded primarily as an instrument of good will; moreover, it gives the signatory countries fishing rights in the stream of Mutual Assistance money that flows out of Washington in every direction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contiguous Mexico is the one country to the south of us that might not be a total liability in a mutual defense arrangement; but she did not sign the Rio Pact. She didn't have to. Why should she pledge anything to the American power that is bound to protect her anyhow?

BUT THE SHAPE of the free world seems to be eluding us still. Let us now try stalking it through the dimness of American foreign policy. In his message to Congress last May, asking 5 billion more for the Mutual Security Program (which turned out to be 7 billion for the fiscal year), President Eisenhower said it was "to enable the United States to carry out its responsibilities of leadership in building up the security of the free world". At another time he said these responsibilities might continue for many years. What are they? What are the economic and military commitments of the United States toward what Mr. Eisenhower imagines the free world to be?

You will be astonished. By treaty and pact the United States is unequivocally committed to defend 23 countries on three continents, with a total population of 430 million people.

If to these you add the countries that have been receiving aid under the Mutual Assistance Programs — countries therefore that would look to the United States for both military and economic defense — you get seven more, with a population of 165 million people.

If you add Spain, with whom we have just made a deal for bases which we should have to defend to save our own things, and then Malaya, which we should have to defend for Great Britain's sake, and, thirdly, those South American countries that have not signed the Rio Pact and are nevertheless under the umbrella of American power, you have eight countries more, with a total population of 67 million.

You have to add 60 million Germans who, until they are permitted to arm themselves, must rely heavily upon American power to defend them against Russia.

That is not all. There are neutral countries receiving Mutual Assistance dollars, whose defense in certain circumstances would almost certainly be deemed vital to the security of the United States, in the case of Russian aggression. India is one, Egypt is another. That makes two more countries with a population of 365 million.

Now you have more than 40 countries, in four continents, to whose defense the United States is committed either directly by treaty and pact or morally by implication of its foreign policy. Their total population is more than one billion, and that is practically one-half of the entire human race — to be defended by 160 million Americans. And to a very large proportion of that half of the human race the kind of freedom we think we are talking about is totally unknown.

And still do you know what the free world is? Or where it is? Or what it will fight for? Will it fight for the security of the United States?

*Additional Copies:* 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 45 Wednesday, November 11, 1953 Washington, D. C.

**A Call for Realignment:** "Razor-thin Administration majorities in Congress and the election results compel Republicans to take stock, to re-appraise the Republican situation in practical terms", remarks Senator Karl Mundt (R., S.D.), in an exclusive statement given to HUMAN EVENTS. "The election results in Virginia and in New York merely confirm what is well known, that the Republican strength is outside the South and outside the big cities of the North. Elsewhere, as a sectional party, Republican strength is overwhelming."

"Which way to turn for allies?", asks the Senator. "To compete for votes with the New and Fair Dealers in the big northern cities is to rive the Republican Party asunder and destroy it. To turn southward toward a natural ally presents no such problem, and no competition is involved. Half of the Southern voters voted against the New Deal Northern Democrat candidate last year and deprived him of forty-five per cent of their electoral votes (57)."

Mundt, who is the outstanding exponent of political realignment in Congress, goes on: "Administration majorities in the Congress would be overwhelming if Republicans and Southern Democrats could combine on an equitable basis in the official majorities of the Senate and the House of Representatives. (So combined, they could re-elect the Administration in 1956.) By informal alliances these groups have contrived a great many times in the past 20 years to stop the socialistic plans and programs of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers."

Mundt concludes with a concrete proposal: "As a first step in the overdue party realignment which I have long been urging, I propose that Republicans in Congress consider inviting Southern Democrats into the Administration majorities. I believe that our Southern colleagues will prefer to be allied nationally with friends in the North — Republicans — rather than with the unfriendly forces of the Northern Democrats. The time for constructive leadership is now."

**The Man of the Hour:** The Attorney General broke all records in our political history when he convincingly accused a former President of knowingly retaining a Soviet spy in Government. All Washington — except the New Dealers — expressed admiration for Brownell (also for Eisenhower who reportedly cleared the Brownell attack), and joined in Senator Jenner's enthusiastic plaudit, "At last we have an Attorney General."

No informed person here, of course, felt any surprise either at the official designation of the man who called himself Harry Dexter White as a Soviet spy, nor at the data which Brownell adduced to prove Truman had kept White in a Government job even after the FBI had reported him to be a spy. Truman's evasions and denials convinced nobody — save the Fifth Column. It was remarked that the FBI can only report, but cannot "clean out" the spies. The "liberals" and "anti-anti-Communists" have kept insisting that congressional probe committees should leave such matters entirely to the FBI.

The timing of the release of the accusation has been criticized — but probably was only an example of the too prevalent bungling in press relations which marks the Ike regime. Logically, the data on Truman should have been released before the elections. It showed a lack of *savoir faire* to release it so soon after the elections. It is also known that the Department of Justice has for some months been quietly creating new subdivisions for the investigation of subversives.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How does it happen that this thunderbolt was launched by Brownell, who was Dewey's right hand, apparently shared Dewey's "liberal" and "me-too" policies and reportedly appointed many Dewey men during the Ike Administration?

Believe it or not — there is a school of thought among political observers here which ever since inauguration has contended that Brownell was no longer Dewey's man once he came to Washington; that in the past he had had serious differences with Dewey (although this was kept very quiet); that he was therefore happy to get away from the Dewey entourage (how many Dewey men may also feel that way?) and would like to carve out a career for himself. As for the Dewey men to whom Brownell gave patronage, they are not Dewey but Brownell men (so it is argued). Such is a prevalent, although very confidential view here in the Capital and it may account for the Brownell adventure.

But is this all? No — according to many observers; it is just the beginning.

Brownell reportedly has decided to make Truman the center of a sustained Administration attack not only on the Communist issue, but also on crime, graft and tax-fixing. It has been known for some time that a committee of the House has been "sitting on" some very explosive evidence which includes transcripts of conversations by denizens of the White House during the last Presidential regime. In any case, Brownell will take the lead in telling the American people why the mess is so big in Washington today, after 20 years of New Deal rule.

If the Attorney General does not falter in this course, he can work some drastic alterations in the political landscape. He could — if he maintains the audacity he has shown in the past week — mount a big drive against the New Deal Democrats (specifically excepting the Jeffersonian Democrats, if he is wise) as the "Party of Moscow" — a rather accurate description, as a glance at the situation in New York will show.

**The Party of Moscow:** The Democratic victory in the New York City Mayoralty campaign is a sinister portent despite the fact that most commentators dismiss it as of only local significance. Wagner's triumph has dangerous potentialities, for the following reasons:

(1) The Wagner slate received the backing of the *Daily Worker*, and reportedly the cadres of the Communist Party worked for his success. (See our story on October 14 which quotes party instructions given to the cadres, to work for Wagner.) This Communist maneuver is no mere case of a small minority trying to clamber on a bandwagon which would have won anyway. Wagner — it is important to recall — won by a plurality, not an overall majority in the four-candidate race. It is difficult to prove, but a very likely possibility is that the 200,000 estimated Communists and fellow-travellers in New York City may have ensured Wagner's victory. In one way or another the Communists — it is believed — will seek rewards and will try to extend their influence over the Wagner regime.

Indeed, students of the "party line" remind us that the American Labor Party in New York was for many years the Communist Party's docile puppet. But now — say these students — it looks as if the Kremlin is moving to discard the ALP and to order the Communists here to concentrate on infiltrating the Democratic Party.

(2) The Wagner victory ensures the nomination of Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as candidate for Governor next year. With the Fay-Wicks revelations, the Republican Party in New York State enters very troubled waters, and the Democrats figure that young Roosevelt, trading on the tradition of his father (which is still strong in New York City) might win in 1954. That would place him in a commanding position for the Presidential sweepstakes in 1956.

Now, it is a little known fact that the Soviet press in Russia still pays tribute to the memory of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is little doubt that F.D.R., Jr., invoking his father's memory, would serve well the purposes of the Kremlin in the U.S.A. Indeed, the Democratic Party in the North is the most effective political tool available to Soviet Russia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Only a Republican Party, directed by men of determination and foresight such as Brownell, can checkmate this game of the Kremlin.

**The Fallacy of Republican Liberalism:** The lesson of the defeat of the Republican state regime in New Jersey is this: by "going liberal", it lost the Governorship.

A student of that state's politics — Mr. R. E. Moore, an independent businessman of Newark — has given us the following account so well buttressed by statistics, that we hasten to offer it as the best explanation of the New Jersey outcome.

Alfred E. Driscoll, who had been a State Senator and not too well known, was elected Governor on the GOP ticket first in 1946. His then liberal views, if any, were quite unknown to the mass of the people who voted for him. He won the Governorship by a landslide majority of 219,000 votes. His majority in the 20 counties outside Hudson County was 287,755.

Why except Hudson? Because that is the old Hague territory which has traditionally been the strongest Democratic area, usually going to that party by over 60 per cent of the vote. In 1946, Hudson went strongly anti-Driscoll in the voting.

Did Driscoll after election turn on and rend the Democratic enemy, symbolized by Hudson county? Not at all, Driscoll soon after his first win as Governor revealed himself as "liberal", pushing various policies made famous by the New Deal. Rapidly, his great strength (which put him in office) in the downstate counties began to decline. By the time re-election year (1949) rolled around, the Driscoll aides saw they were in trouble. A deal was made with Democratic elements in Hudson County for the election.

In 1949 Driscoll emerged the victor again, but this time by a majority of only 77,200 (as contrasted with 219,000 three years before). In the 20 counties outside Hudson his majority of 287,755 (in 1946) fell to 80,000 in 1949. In Hudson county, his vote rose from 36 per cent (in 1946) to 49 per cent in 1949.

Driscoll retired this year, and one of his machine, Paul Troast, ran for Governor as GOP candidate. He was beaten by the Democrat who got a 150,000 majority. It was solely a Republican defeat on the Executive level, for the GOP kept its strong hold on the Legislative. An examination of county by county vote shows the traditionally big Republican counties giving a declining vote to their candidates for Governor — thus, Bergen County was typical: 71% for Driscoll in 1946; 62% in 1949 and 51% (for Troast) in 1953. The curve over the years is as follows: in 1946 Republicans cast 62.7% of the vote for Governor; in 1949 — 52.8%; and in 1953 — 47.3%.

There have been numerous explanations for the GOP defeat for Governorship in Jersey; but the above statistics suggest that the real reason was that the Republican Executive deserted the forces who originally elected him, embraced "liberalism" and in the end his candidate, Troast, reaped the bitter harvest. The lesson could be instructive on a national scale.

**Farm Front:** "I have yet to find a single farmer who is upset about Benson, that is, unless he is a confirmed New Dealer, either Republican or Democrat", writes Karl Butler, in his column "Farm and Food", in the Syracuse *Post Standard* (October 18). Butler, agricultural expert for the Co-operative GLF Exchange of Ithaca, N. Y., has just returned from a trip through the Middle West interviewing farmers and farm leaders.

He goes on: "Most of the noise originates, either publicly or otherwise, from a few self-centered politicians who are convinced that to get the farm vote they have to promise more than anyone else has in the past. It would certainly be refreshing occasionally to have a Congressman, who will soon be up for re-election, looking out for the interest of all of us rather than just a handful of his constituents and par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticularly for his own neck. I sometimes wonder if freedom-loving farmers or the rest of America are going to sit by and let a cotton or wheat politician write the ticket for American agriculture."

**What Price Israel,** by Alfred Lilienthal. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $3.95. Reviewed by Frank Chodorov.

It has been said that the "Jewish Problem" is a problem that the non-Jew makes for himself and is not of Jewish origin; that the bigot suffers from an inner conflict for which he seeks an objective victim. Be that as it may, there is now a Jewish problem of deep annoyance to Jews and it is due entirely to an internecine conflict.

To many, Judaism is a faith and a culture, and that's all. To the Zionists, however, it is a political institution primarily. Stated thus, the conflict seems to be semantic. The Zionist however does not let it go at that, but insists that every Jew, no matter where he lives or to what country he pledges allegiance, is a born citizen of the State of Israel, and does not hesitate to bring economic and social pressure to bear upon Jews who see no relation between religion and nationality. Obviously, any American, regardless of his religion, resents such an arbitrary claim on his national loyalty, and sees no reason for abandoning the American tradition for one with which he has no attachment. And when the Zionists, well-organized, and absolutely ruthless in their methods, attempt to alienate the Jew from the land he loves, a bitter fight is inevitable.

The story of this conflict within the American Jewish community is lucidly detailed in *What Price Israel,* by Alfred Lilienthal, a Jew who has felt the lash of Zionist whips. Though this book is by no means a personal complaint, one can realize from what Mr. Lilienthal tells of his experience with Zionists that the writing of it (as well as the publishing of it) took some courage. As an instance of the lengths to which Zionists will go to impose their point of view, and suppress any evidence derogatory to their purpose, an incident reported to us by the publisher (who is not a Jew) is worth telling. After the book was announced, but before it appeared on the market, an ostensible agent of the Anti-Defamation League — which seems to have a tie-up with the Zionist organization — called on the publisher and suggested that it would be best for him if he did not put out the book. In modern parlance, he suggested "book burning".

The audacity of the Zionists in pursuing their purpose is not limited to the pressure they are bringing on Jews. To this reviewer, the most frightening aspect of their campaign is the pressure they have been able to bring on the American government to obtain its support for the establishment and maintainance of Israel. This pressure, quite obviously, is their threat to withhold the alleged "Jewish vote" from the politician on the carpet, or their promise to deliver it if he behaves. Whether there is such a deliverable bloc of votes is open to question; but from Woodrow Wilson to Eisenhower, the threat and the promise have been used effectively. Roosevelt and Truman were particularly amenable to the demands of the Zionists, and it is doubtful that the State of Israel would have been established, when and as it was, if it were not for the cooperation of these American Presidents. And only yesterday the Republican candidate for Mayor of New York was assuring the Zionist vote in New York that the Eisenhower Administration will not withdraw financial support of Israel.

This is the "Jewish" problem that has many good Americans of the Jewish faith annoyed and worried. They not only resent the attempt to pin dual citizenship on them, but are afraid that the arrogance and pugnaciousness of the Zionists may bring upon them the understandable resentment of non-Jews. If this book does nothing more than to assure Americans of all faiths that Zionism is not Judaism, that it is rather the mania of a nationalist-minded group, it will have achieved a good purpose. Every Jew who has cowered before this group will welcome it, even though he may pull down the shades while reading it.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED